

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CLARENCE OTWORTH,

Plaintiff,

v.

PAM CURTIS,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:20-CV-651

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

ORDER

This is a civil action brought by a *pro se* plaintiff. The Court's subject matter jurisdiction is in question. The complaint describes the basis for subject matter jurisdiction as federal question under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and deprivation of rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1, PageID.1.) But the Court does not discern a substantive federal question in the complaint. To the extent the plaintiff is attempting to raise federal claims, the plaintiff fails to articulate a cognizable federal question. "[A] district court may, at any time, *sua sponte* dismiss a complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure when the allegations of a complaint are totally implausible, attenuated, unsubstantial frivolous, devoid of merit, or no longer open to discussion." *Apple v. Glenn*, 183 F.3d 477, 479 (6th Cir. 1999). The vague, attenuated, and unsubstantial allegations set forth in the plaintiff's complaint are insufficient to establish subject matter jurisdiction.

ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED:

Plaintiff shall **SHOW CAUSE** no later than **August 10, 2020**, why the case should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Date: July 21, 2020

/s/ Robert J. Jonker
ROBERT J. JONKER
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE